

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/632,445	08/01/2003	Charles C. H. Yang	D0332	2838
759	0 07/06/2005		EXAM	INER
George J. Netter			BLAU, STEPHEN LUTHER	
Suite 216				
260 S. Los Robles			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Pasadena, CA 91101-2897			3711	

DATE MAILED: 07/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•		<i>\bar{b}</i>				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
•	10/632,445	YANG, CHARLES C. H.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
•	Stephen L. Blau	3711				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>01 Au</u>	<u>ugust 2003</u> .					
2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) ☑ This	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray	vn from consideration.	•				
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-6</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r alaction requirement					
	election requirement.					
Application Papers	•					
9)⊠ The specification is objected to by the Examine						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the one of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction		· •				
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex		• •				
	animer. Note the attached Office	AMON OF 101111   10-102.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents		-(d) or (f).				
2. Certified copies of the priority documents	•	on No.				
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior						
application from the International Bureau	(PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	of the certified copies not receive	d.				
	*					
An about A	•					
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary	(DTO 412)				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ate				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5)  Notice of Informal Page 6) Other:	atent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 3711

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Specification

- 1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:
- a. On page 5 line 1 the continuous wall is referred to as reference number 66
   while in figure 4 and in line 12 of page 5 the opening is referred to as reference number
   66.
- b. On page 5 line 1 the central cavity is referred to as reference number 68 while in figure 5 and in line 16 of page 5 the weights are referred to as reference number 68.

Appropriate correction is required.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Aizawa.

Aizawa discloses a metal striking plate of titanium (Col. 6, Ln. 12), a central housing in the form of a front shell (87a, Fig. 6) which a hosel and shaft is connected

Art Unit: 3711

(Figs. 6, 1) and including a surface to fittingly engage with a striking plate rear surface (Fig. 6), a back housing in the form of a rear shell (87b, Fig. 6) having an edge wall secured to a portion of a central housing part (Fig. 6, Col. 6, Lns. 37-40), and means for securing a striking plate to a central housing part in the form of a plurality of metal pegs (95, 97) unitarily interconnecting a striking plate and central housing part together (Fig. 6, Col. 6, Lns. 53-67).

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aizawa in view of Werner.

Aizawa discloses forming the head body of carbon fiber reinforced with resin (Col. 7, Lns. 60-67). Aizawa lacks a central housing part and back housing part being a graphite carbon fiber and a central housing part and back housing part being secured together by cement. Werner discloses a forward shell and rear shell being made of a graphite fiber (Col. 2, Lns. 8-15) and a forward shell and rear shell being secured together by cement (Col. 6, Lns. 38-40, Fig. 8A). In view of the patent of Werner it would have been obvious to modify the head of Aizawa to have a central housing part

Art Unit: 3711

and back housing part being a graphite carbon fiber in order to use a carbon fiber used in the market place to form golf heads. In view of the patent of Werner it would have been obvious to modify the head of Aizawa to have a central housing part and back housing part being secured together by cement in order to utilize an adhesive used in the market place to secure composite shells together in forming a golf head.

6. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aizawa in view of Werner as applied to claims 3 and 5 above, and further in view of Helsmstetter.

Aizawa lacks striking plate weighing approximately 4.5 ounces (127 grams) and the combined weight of a central housing part and back housing part weighing about 4.5 ounces (127 grams). Helmstetter discloses a mass of a head being in a range of 165 to 300 grams (Col. 13, Lns. 58-60). In view of the patent of Helmstetter it would have been obvious to modify the head of Aizawa to have a striking plate weighing approximately 4.5 ounces (127 grams) and the combined weight of a central housing part and back housing part weighing about 4.5 ounces (127 grams) in order to have a total head weight (254 grams) used in the market place.

7. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aizawa in view of Bliss and Hasebe.

Aizawa lacks at least one weight in the range of 5-30 grams secured to the inner bottom wall of the back housing part along the centerline plane between the heel and toe of the head, a center of gravity lies on the centerline plane between the heel toe.

Art Unit: 3711

and within the back part cavity and below the centerline plane between top and bottom surface of the central housing part.

Bliss discloses a weight secured to an inner bottom wall (Abstract, Fig. 5), a center of gravity lies on the centerline plane between the heel and toe (Fig. 5), and within the back part of a head (Fig. 5) and below the centerline plane between top and bottom of a head (Fig. 5) in order to take advantage of vertical gear effect to tailor the amount of backspin imparted to a ball for a given loft angle thereby enabling a club to deliver the ideal trajectory without over spinning or under spinning the ball [0005]. Bliss does not disclose the specific mass of the weight but clearly an artisan skilled in adding weight to a sole to move center of gravity would have added a suitable mass to the sole in which a mass of 5-30 grams is included. In view of the Bliss it would have been obvious to modify the head of Aizawa to have a weight secured to an inner bottom wall, a center of gravity lies on the centerline plane between the heel and toe, and within the back part cavity and below the centerline plane between top and bottom of a head in order to take advantage of vertical gear effect to tailor the amount of backspin imparted to a ball for a given loft angle thereby enabling a club to deliver the ideal trajectory without over spinning or under spinning the ball. In view of the Bliss it would have been obvious to modify the head of Aizawa to have at least one weight in the range of 5-30 grams in order to add a sufficient amount of weight to move the center of gravity of a head.

Hasebe discloses at least one weight (B) secured to the inner bottom wall of the back housing part along the centerline plane between the heel and toe of the head (Fig.

Page 6

Application/Control Number: 10/632,445

Art Unit: 3711

4). In view of the patent of Hasebe it would have been obvious to modify the head of Aizawa to have at least one weight secured to the inner bottom wall of the back housing part along the centerline plane between the heel and toe of the head in order to maximize the amount of energy transferred to a ball at impact by maximizing the amount of weight directly behind the ball.

#### Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steve Blau whose telephone number is (703) 308-2712. The examiner is available Monday through Friday from 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.. If the examiner is unavailable you can contact his supervisor Greg Vidovich whose telephone number is (703) 308-1513. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0858. (TC 3700 Official Fax 703-872-9306)

slb/7 September 2004

PRIMARY EXAMINER

# This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning Operations and is not part of the Official Record

### **BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:
D BLACK BORDERS
☐ IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
☐ FADED TEXT OR DRAWING
☐ BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING
☐ SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
☐ COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS
☐ GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS
☐ LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT
☐ REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY
П отнер.

# IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.